

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OIL DRILLING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Ms. KAPTUR, who just spoke. She and I have been friends for a long, long time, and I agree with much of what she just said.

We really need to move toward energy independence, and we need to use alternative methods of getting our independence. The problem is it's going to take time. If we use solar, if we use wind power, if we use all of these alternative sources, it's going to take time. It isn't going to happen in 1 year, 2, 3, or 4 years where we can not rely on oil or gas any longer. It's going to take time. In the meantime, Americans are paying \$4-plus per gallon of gasoline because we don't have the oil necessary to keep the cost of gasoline down.

She is absolutely correct. We depend too much on foreign sources of oil. We depend on Saudi Arabia. We depend on Venezuela, which is not a friend of ours. We depend on Canada, on Mexico and on other countries throughout the world. We ought to be drilling right here in America. We have enough energy in this country to become energy independent.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, well, that's going to take time. It may take 10 years, if we get oil out of the ground today, to get it to market. Well, if that is the case, we still should do it, but experts whom I've talked to who have geological backgrounds say that we can start getting that oil to market within 1 or 2 years, and we could force the price of oil down very quickly if we decide we're going to drill here because it's going to put pressure on those who are producing oil that we're using around the world. It's going to force them to reevaluate the cost that they're charging us for the oil we're getting from them.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, oh, these oil companies have all of these permits, and they ought to be drilling where they have those permits now. Those permits run 5 to 10 years. If they don't drill in those areas, then those permits expire, and they're bid on by somebody else.

So why would an oil company not want to drill if they have a permit?

It's because, when they get that permit, they don't know how much oil is down there, and they're certainly not going to invest millions or billions of dollars to drill for oil when they know it's not there. Once they get the permit, they do a geological study, and they do seismic studies to find out if

there's oil down there. If there is no oil there, they don't drill, and so they don't utilize their permits. That's why we need to get more land available for drilling.

Right now, on the Continental Shelf, we're using 3 percent of the available area. Ninety-seven percent is not being explored. We can do that in an environmentally safe way, and we ought to allow these oil companies to drill in those other areas and get permits to do it. If there's oil there, they're going to drill there.

Why don't they drill in some of these other areas where there might be some oil?

Well, it costs \$2 billion to explore and to build an oil derrick, a platform, out in the Gulf of Mexico or out on the Continental Shelf. If they can't make \$2 billion back, they ain't going to drill there. That's why these permits, many times, are not useful, and that's why we need to explore in other areas.

Now I'd like to also talk really briefly about the ANWR. They have done geological studies up there, and they know that there are billions of barrels of oil up there. If we drill there, we can get 1 million barrels of oil a day to help lower the price of gasoline in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I were talking to Americans tonight instead of to my colleagues—and I can't do that because we can't address Americans—I would say this: You ought to contact your Congressman and Senators and say, "I want my gas prices reduced, and I want you to drill in America. I want you to move this country toward energy independence." We talked about it 30 years ago under the Carter administration, and we never did it.

If I were talking to them, Mr. Speaker, I would say that you ought to tell your Congressman to get with the program, to drill in America, to make us energy independent, and to bring down the price of energy, especially that of our gasoline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DOCTOR-OWNED HOSPITALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, the New York Times published a story that raised questions about Senators that amended legislation to protect home State hos-

pitals from a new move in this Congress to ban doctor-owned hospitals. The article labeled these actions as "special interest" and questioned their appropriateness. It cited specific Senators, including a senior Senator from my State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the circumstances surrounding each hospital in the article, but I am very familiar with Wenatchee Valley Medical Center and efforts being undertaken by those who represented in Congress to protect this institution from the threat of a government-forced closure or sale.

The criticism leveled against the Washington State Senator in the New York Times article is unjustified and totally without merit. Senator MURRAY's action to protect the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center was entirely appropriate. In fact, it's what this Nation's citizens should expect from their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it's troubling that the targets of scrutiny are those who are standing up and who are protecting their constituents and not those seeking to force the closure or sale of a hometown hospital system simply because it is doctor-owned.

The Wenatchee Valley Medical Center and its seven clinics serve a rural population, in my State, of a quarter of a million people in an area the size of the State of Maryland. The medical center accepts all patients regardless of their ability to pay, and it has a long record of providing quality care. Today, it is jointly owned by 150 doctors. For this simple reason, it is a target for some who think doctor ownership should be banned.

Twice in this Congress House Democrats have passed bills that would outlaw the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center as it exists today, not because of any poor care or bad behavior by its doctors but simply because it is owned by doctors. I offered amendments to both bills. Some of my amendments would have stopped the ban on doctor-owned hospitals. Others would have altered the ban to protect the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center. Unfortunately, House Democrat leaders blocked every one from even being debated and voted on the floor of the House. These same House leaders also swept aside the objections and concerns of at least eleven Democrats who have spoken out against this proposal and the harm it would cause to their local hospitals.

When I last spoke on the House floor against such legislation, I asked the Democrat chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee if he would work with me to exempt the few existing doctor-owned hospitals that would be impacted in both Democrat and Republican districts. He replied, "The answer is no."

The Democrat chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health

was quoted by the New York Times as saying, "He would prefer not to exempt any doctor-owned hospitals."

When the Federal Government dictates that doctors can't own a hospital, Mr. Speaker, this is a step towards a Canadian-style, government-run health care system under which the Federal Government decides where, when, how, and even if Americans get care. This means Americans could be faced with waiting lists and rationing and bureaucrats, not doctors, making decisions about their health.

With those who control the House intent and insistent on banning doctor-owned hospitals, at a minimum, protection must be given to allow existing facilities like the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center to continue serving patients like it has, Mr. Speaker, for 60 years.

Being 1 out of 100, the powers of an individual Senator are considerable. Senator MURRAY used her committee position to add language protecting the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center to legislation that included the ban on doctor-owned hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, she has done the right thing. Despite what may have been printed in the New York Times, I will keep working with Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL and Congresswoman McMORRIS RODGERS to fully protect the Wenatchee Valley Medical Center. I reject any notion that what Senator MURRAY has done is anything but appropriate and necessary, and I commend her for her actions.

□ 2045

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is June 19, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,932 days since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy,

this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victim, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them. And it seems so sad to me, Madam Speaker, that this Sunset Memorial may be the only acknowledgement or remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this Chamber.

So as a small gesture, I would ask those in the Chamber who are inclined to join me for a moment of silent memorial to these lost little Americans.

So Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this Sunset Memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,932 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that it is time that we stood up together again, and remembered that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust; and we are still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the plight of unborn America tonight, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 19, 2008, 12,932 days since *Roe versus Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children; this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF GENERAL MICHAEL T. MOSELEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my appreciation to a fine public servant and military officer, former Air Force Chief of Staff, General Michael T. Moseley, who recently resigned on orders from the Secretary of Defense.

The timing of this unprecedented decision to dismiss both top Air Force leaders only days before the decision on the tanker program, and during a time of wartime stress on Air Force personnel, is unfortunate. Nevertheless, every military and civilian officer knows that he serves at the pleasure of the President and can be dismissed for any reason. As professional leaders, General Moseley and former Secretary Wynne accepted that fact.

Unfortunately, the entire record of their decades of public service may be at risk of being pushed aside.

In particular regard to General Michael Moseley, it would be hard to find a more competent and experienced Air Force chief since the service's inception over 60 years ago. Entering the Air Force in 1971, he quickly rose through the ranks, and his competency as the top F-15 pilot led to command responsibilities around the world. Like no other Air Force Chief in a generation, General Moseley demonstrated he knew how to command air power during combat operations because he led coalition Air Forces in Afghanistan and Iraq that employed greater precision and air-ground coordination than ever before.

He served as Chief of the Air Force during a very tumultuous time. He confronted the challenging budget and personnel cuts posed by the Quadrennial Defense Review, as well as additional cuts administered or mandated by the administration.

He helped to steer the Air Force through some tough times, and in so doing, and to his credit, he always put the airmen and their families first. He recognized that our Nation unwisely took a "holiday from history" in the 1990s by delaying aircraft modernization and, as a result, our pilots are flying aircraft that average nearly 40 years of age. We have F-15s literally falling apart in the air. We have F-16s that are nearing the end of their service-life. We have 40-year-old tankers and 50-year-old bombers.

And we have Third World nations that are fielding fighters that are, or soon will be, equal to our fourth-generation fighters. And, at the same